

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 and 27-30 were examined in the office action mailed on 04/02/2008 (hereafter "Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

By virtue of this paper, the specification and claims 1, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 21, 27 and 29 are sought to be amended, and claims 5, 11, 28 sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellations are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments, and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-22, 27 and 29-30 are thus respectfully presented for consideration further in view of the below remarks.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149629 issued to Craycroft *et al* (hereafter "Craycroft") in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101444 issued to Novak *et al* (hereafter "Novak") and US Patent No. 5,596,702 issued to Stucka *et al* (hereafter "Stucka").

Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the Office Action, Applicants assert that the presented claims are allowable over the art of record.

Applicants first respectfully point out that the Examiner is required to make broadest possible interpretation of the claim terms, ONLY in a way that are reasonable **in view of the specification**. The specification clearly establishes that the invention provides **custom** desired experience while accessing individual files by providing **an association** of individual files with corresponding experience profiles. The specification further sets forth that such custom desired experience is **not provided** in case of operating system defaults or application defaults, implying that when the same profile is applicable to all files that are to be opened/accessed, the requisite custom experience would be lacking. This customization is required when the files are opened with the **same application**. The Examiner ignores these

required interpretations in the choice of references and in reading the claims on to various references.

Turning now to individual claims, currently amended claim 1 recites that

(F1) the user be provided the ability to specify different experience profiles in relation to different electronic files in **the same digital processing system**;

5 (F2) entries indicating the association of different electronic files with corresponding experience profiles **be stored in a memory**;

(F3) requests to **open the two electronic files** be received **after the entries are stored in the memory**;

10 (F4) the files be opened in response to the open requests and the experience be controlled according to the entries stored in the memory;

(F5) access to content of both the files be provided using the **same application**;

(F6) access to **a substantial portion** of the data stored in each file be provided.

At least the portions of the references relied upon by the Examiner do not teach several of the above noted features.

15 In particular, “font” and “Icon” (page 3, lines 4-5 of the Outstanding Office Action) of Craycroft cannot clearly be equated with the claimed data, to which access is provided since these are **not stored** within the electronic files accessed.

20 Furthermore, the details in the listview of Figure 2C of Craycroft do not constitute content/ data stored in the electronic files. The features size/ kind/ label/ date/ version/ comments, are also at best information **about the** data stored (content) in the electronic files. While the Patent Office is entitled to a broad interpretation, that breadth is required **to be reasonable in view of the specification**. A skilled practitioners in possession of applicants’ disclosure (e.g., reference to music in paragraph 0004 and reference to Word Processor and Music players in paragraph 0053) would interpret the data in the electronic files to mean the  
25 content of the files and not information about the content.

Even if the features in the list view of Craycroft constitutes data stored in an electronic file, it is respectfully noted that the related data would **not be substantial**, thereby not teaching or reasonably suggesting feature F6 noted above.

Furthermore, Craycroft does not teach or reasonably suggest enabling a user to associate different experience profiles with different files and storing information representing the different association of individual files with corresponding experience profiles in a memory. Some of the “objects” on the desktop of Craycroft can be electronic files.

As a result, in Craycroft, a theme selection there would affect ALL the objects on the desktop. Thus, the same previously selected theme of Craycroft (which was selected before the opening) would control display of the detail of the list view when requests to open two files are received (after storing the user selections of association of profiles). Accordingly, the combination of features F3 and F4 would be contradicted when Craycroft provides different behavioral themes of desktops.

At least for one or more of the reasons noted above, the portions of Craycroft relied upon by the Examiner are defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness as against currently amended claim 1.

The remaining references relied upon by the Examiner do not cure the above deficiencies.

As a threshold matter, the claim requires **opening of the two files using the same application**. Thus, even assuming arguendo that the teachings of Craycroft and Novak constitute applications, they are pointed to be substantially different applications (while Craycroft relates to switching themes in Graphical user interfaces, Novak relates to creating skins) and thus the combination would still contradict feature F5 above.

Furthermore, since Novak also does not teach associating different skins to different individual songs, the combination of features F3 and F4 would be contradicted in the

teachings of Novak as well (for reasons similar to those noted above with respect to Craycroft).

5 Stucka also does not cure several of the above noted deficiencies. While Stucka relates generally to sharing user interface displays (program code for different portions of user interfaces) among multiple application programs, a change of user interface would affect access to all files and thus the combination of F3 and F4 would be contradicted. Stucka simply does not provide for associating different sub-hierarchies of interfaces for different files, rather the sub-hierarchies are determined by the specific desired function **for the entire application** (and would thereby apply to all files, even assuming arguing that the concepts of Stucka are applicable to accessing files).

10 Irrespective, it is respectfully pointed out that the Examiner is engaging in impermissible hindsight in combining the three references at least in a way to render obvious the present invention. In particular, Stucka relates to the 'development phase' of the application, while Novak and Craycroft relate to the post-deployment use by end-users. It is accordingly submitted that the subject matters of Stucka and the remaining references relied  
15 by the Examiner, are directed to different problems/areas to the extent one skilled in the relevant arts would not have been motivated to combine the references as alleged by the Examiner.

20 At least for the reasons noted above, previously presented claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 27 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Currently amended claim 7 is independently allowable over the art of record in reciting that a open request of a first electronic file causes the file to be opened for editing, as well as a music file to be played, due to prior user specification of playing of the music file as an attribute associated with the first electronic file.

25 The Examiner relied on "... Compare song list in Fig. 14 with Figs. 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 et seq. of Novak..." (See Page 5 lines 14-17 of the Outstanding Office

Action). It is believed that the Examiner equates the song list of Figure 14 of Novak with the claimed first electronic file. Such a comparison fails to read on the claimed features of claim 7, as explained below.

With respect to song list, Novak discloses:

5 [0161] Subviews 1404 and 1406 are designed to look like speakers and are user engagable to reveal hidden controls and a playlist, respectively. **Specifically, by engaging a button 1412, a user can expand or "pull out" a drawer that contains,** in the case of subview 1404 various controls, and in the case of **subview 1406 a playlist.**

10 [0162] When **a user clicks on button 1412,** the layout manager 1106 (FIG. 11) is responsible for redrawing the subview. Without the subviews, to provide the same functionality, the layout manager would have to redraw each individual control button and determine where it is to be drawn relative to any other control buttons. The layout manager might have to be this many many times in order to smoothly transition from the top view of skin 1400 to the bottom view of skin 1400. With subviews, however, the layout manager simply redraws the subview or the container in which all of the control buttons appear.

20 (Relevant Paragraphs of Novak, **Emphasis Added**)

With respect to playing songs, Novak discloses:

[0075] Buttons

25 [0076] **Buttons are a popular part of a skin and can be used to trigger actions such as play,** stop, quit, minimize, and switch to different view. The Windows Media Player provides the skin creator with two types of button elements: the BUTTON element and the BUTTONGROUP element. In addition, there can be several predefined types of buttons.

(Relevant Paragraphs of Novak, **Emphasis Added**)

30 From the above emphasized portions, Novak discloses that a button is used for playing a song and button 1412 is engaged to pull out subview 1406 of playlist.

Therefore, even assuming arguendo that the play list of Novak is akin to the claimed first electronic file, it is noted that **separate actions/buttons are required** to play a song and to view the play list in Novak.

35 At least for such a reason, currently amended claim 7 is independently allowable over the art of record.

Currently amended claim 8 is also independently allowable in reciting the order in which the values specified by different entities are overridden. The claim recites that the

value specified by operating system default, the application default, the experience profile (for the specific electronic file) and the electronic file for the same attribute are overridden in that order.

In particular, the claimed fourth attribute recites that a value specified in the electronic file for the same attribute overrides any values provided by operating system default, application default and the associated experience profile when providing access to the content of a file. The claimed first attribute recites that a value specified in the experience profile overrides values provided for the same attribute by the operating system default and application default (when the electronic file does not provide a value for that attribute). The claimed second attribute recites that a value specified by the application default overrides values provided for the same attribute by the operating system default (when none of the experience profile and electronic file provides a value for that attribute). The claimed third attribute recites that a value specified by the operating system default is used when none of application default, the experience profile and electronic file provides a value for that attribute.

The Examiner simply relies on Col. 10 lines 1-45 of Stucka (in addition to portions of Craycroft) to teach the various features of claim 8. As best understood, the related portion of Stucka teaches broadly the ability of one application to dynamically share the user-interface sub-hierarchies of other application using the user interface server.

It is unclear to the undersigned representative how the related teachings either expressly or inherently teaches the various specific features of claim 8 noted above. Should the rejection be maintained, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a more detailed explanation at how the specific teachings of Stucka read on each of the features explained above, so that the applicant can appropriately respond to the rejection.

Currently amended claim 8 is accordingly believed to be independently allowable over the art of record.

Currently amended claim 10 is also allowable over the art of record in reciting that

a song is played automatically when a user opens an electronic file to edit using a word processing application, by virtue of a user having specified the song in association with the electronic file.

The combination of Stucka and Novak clearly does not establish such a causal relation and/or sequence of steps (in playing a song when a user opens a files for editing).

5 In particular, it is pointed out that Novak requires a specific button to be used to play a song, based on the portions (paragraph 0076 of Novak) reproduced above with respect to claim 1. Since Novak requires a technique other than the one claimed, Novak teaches away from the invention of claim 10.

10 Currently amended independent claim 10 is accordingly allowable over the art of record. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 10 and are thus allowable over the art of record at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 10.

15 Currently amended independent claim 14 is also allowable over the art of record in reciting that "... wherein both of said first request and said second request are received *after* said user associates said first experience profile with said first electronic file and said second experience profile with said second electronic file...", for reasons similar to those noted above with respect to feature F3 (in combination with F4) above.

Claims 15-22 depend from claim 14 and are thus allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 14. Currently amended claim 18 is independently allowable at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

20 Currently amended independent claim 29 is allowable over the art of record. The claim recites two situations - (1) when an experience profile is specified associated with an electronic file; and (2) when there is no such association. When there is no association, the default value for an attribute is overridden only by any value within the electronic file.

On the other hand, when the claimed association is present, the default value is

overridden by a value in the experience profile, which is turn is overridden by any value for the same attribute in the electronic file.

In other words, in accordance with claim 28, the claimed experience profile (provided associated with an electronic file) falls in the **third position (i.e., between application defaults and internal values)** in the claimed sequence of overriding.

5           The references of record, either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest such a sequence of overriding. In particular, none of the references (including Stucka) associate experience profiles with individual files. Therefore, the behaviors of the respective environments would not be different for one file having an associated experience profile and another file not having such an association.

10           In particular, in case of Stucka, what are shared are sub-hierarchy of user interfaces, **which do not depend on the specific files being accessed**. The remaining references of record also do not cure such a deficiency. In particular, as noted above, the skins of Novak and the behavior themes of Craycroft affects all accessed files the same way, once they are respectively configured.

15           At least for such a reason, independent claim 29 is allowable over the art of record. New claim 30 depends on claim 29 and is allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 29.

### ***Conclusion***

20           Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: August 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,  
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416